UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,795	06/29/2001	Akira Ishibashi	16869S-027900US	5584
,	7590 05/18/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
	CADERO CENTER		GOTTSCHALK, MARTIN A	
	CO, CA 94111-3834	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3694	1
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/895,795	ISHIBASHI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Martin A. Gottschalk	3694			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status			•			
2a)	<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 December 2006</u>.</li> <li>This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ol>					
Disposit	ion of Claims	•				
5)	Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-23 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/orion Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: and Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The	drawn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  )☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Seriion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to d	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infori	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) sr No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/13/2004</u> .	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 09/895,795 Page 2

Art Unit: 3694

## **DETAILED ACTION**

# Notice to Applicant

1. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-14 and 17-23 have been elected. Claims 15 and 16 have been withdrawn.

#### Election/Restrictions

- 2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-14 and 17-23 in the reply filed on 12/18/2006 is acknowledged.
- 3. This application contains claims 15 and 16 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 12/18/2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 09/895,795

Art Unit: 3694

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. Claims 1-14 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molano et al (US Pat# 6,032,135) in view of Schimmel (PG Pub# US 2002/0103753).
- A. As per claim 1, Molano discloses a settlement system configured to process transactions, the settlement system comprising:

an IC card (Molano: Fig 1, item 24; col 5, lns 37-39);

a transaction terminal (Molano: item 12, col 5, lns 28-37);

a plurality of settlement processors (Molano: Fig 1, items 42, 44, 46; col 6, lns 10-20; Fig 26);

and

an IC card-holder information storage unit configured to store therein:

(i) IC card identification information based on which each of a plurality of IC cards including said IC card can be uniquely identified,

and

(ii) settlement processor information based on which each of said settlement processors can be uniquely identified, wherein each of said plurality of IC cards corresponds to predesignated one or more of the settlement processors (Molano: col 5, Ins 39; col 5, In 66 to col 6, Ins 2; col 6, Ins 50-65; col 3, Ins 24-32);

an approval request receiving unit configured to receive, through said transaction terminal,

IC card identification information,

settlement processor designation information for specifying one or more of the plurality of settlement processors,

and

transaction information containing transaction amount data (Molano: col 9, Ins 59-63, i.e. receiving unit is "transaction host");

and

a settlement request unit configured to

generate settlement request information based on the transaction information and the settlement processor designation information,

and

to transmit the settlement request information thus generated to one or more settlement processors specified by the settlement processor designation information (Molano: col 9, Ins 28-58, i.e. settlement request is coming from terminal).

The system of Molano explicitly teaches the use of an IC card for the aforementioned features, but fails to explicitly teach a central apparatus distinct from the terminal and settlement processors which is functionally inserted between the terminal and the settlement processors, wherein the central apparatus contains the aforementioned units for card-holder information storage, approval request receiving, and settlement request. However, this feature is well-known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Schimmel.

Schimmel teaches a settlement system utilizing multiple payment sources. Said system can be practiced in a distributed or centralized format (Schimmel: abstract;

Application/Control Number: 09/895,795

Art Unit: 3694

[0111], wherein the server running the "Charge Splitter Application" is the central apparatus). The central apparatus has the capabilities of card-holder information storage (Schimmel: [0120]-[0127]); approval request receiving: (Schimmel: [0101]; [0111]); [0128]) and settlement requesting (Schimmel: [0116]-[0117]; [0128]; [0136]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the IC card payment system of Molano with the system of Schimmel for the reason of upgrading through retro-fit (rather than complete replacement, Schimmel: [0070]) the system of Molano by adding the ability to split the costs of a transaction between multiple payment sources (Schimmel: [0029]-[0030]).

B. Claims 2-14 and 17-23 are rejected substantially for the same reasons as provided for claim 1.

### Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches smart card payment systems integrating a plurality of payment and settlement sources.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin A. Gottschalk whose telephone number is (571) 272-7030. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 09/895,795

Art Unit: 3694

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MG

05/12/2007